

Architectural Review Board
Minutes (Via Tele-Conference)
June 1, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kristina McManus, Dwayne Vernon, Debra Smalls, Linda Abate, Sally Gillespie, Kevin Jayroe, & Lee Padgett

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Tracy Gibson & Debra Grant

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Public Input: None**
- III. Approval of minutes for March 23, 2020 (On-site meeting) and May 4, 2020 (Regular monthly meeting);**

Ms. McManus made a motion to approve the minutes of **March 23, 2020** as submitted, seconded by Ms. Smalls; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote (*Ms. Abate' & Mr. Vernon were not present for that meeting*).

Mr. Jayroe made a motion to approve the minutes of **May 4, 2020** with corrections, seconded by Ms. Smalls; the motion carried 5 to 0 by a roll call vote (*Mr. Padgett & Ms. Abate' were not present for that meeting*).

IV. Old Business:

- 1. Mr. Donald Trimble is requesting the approval to replace a front door at 222 Cannon Street.** Tracy/City Staff told the board that the applicant came before them last month seeking the approval to replace windows and a front door that were unsafe, the Board approved the replacement of windows that were not original to the home, but asked that he do some research and chose a door design that would be more in keeping with the period of his home. **Mr. Don Trimble/Applicant** told the board that he submitted 3 photos of the door he would like to install (*City staff received 2 pictures that were sent to the board members*), Mr. Trimble said either option that is approved by the board is fine with him. **Mr. Jayroe** said Mr. Trimble came by his place of business and gave him copies of pictures he took of doors that he thought would be appropriate. **Ms. Gillespie** said she thought either option submitted by Mr. Trimble would be acceptable, if they are wooden doors. **Mr. Trimble** said the door would be wooden.

Motion: Ms. Gillespie made a motion to approve either option of the door Mr. Trimble submitted, citing **Design Standards for Residential Properties, Chapter 3; Section 8.0; page 41 (Doors & Entrances)**, seconded by Ms. McManus; the motion carried 6 to 0 by a roll call vote (*Mr. Vernon did not cast a vote, because he said he did not receive the emailed pictures*).

V. New Business:

- 1. Habitat for Humanity for Dawnella White is requesting the approval to replace windows and a door at 423 Cannon Street.** Tracy Gibson/City Staff told the board that Habitat for

Humanity are in partnership with the City with a repair and renovation program that will help owners with repairs on the exterior of their homes once the applications are approved, at this address they are replacing damaged windows, they would like to install new double pane, single hung clear low E glass, with 6 7/8 white colonial grids, half screens with DP-50 rating. They would also like to replace the damaged wood door with ½ lite glass and grids with a fiberglass JELD-WEN door with ½ lite glass and grids. **Mr. Trevor Hunter/Representative** said the home has existing storm windows and wood windows that do not open, they will be removed and they would like to replace them with the vinyl windows, and a front door replacement, this will upgrade the home and give better ventilation. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if the Habitat for Humanity standards are applied when a home is renovated. **Mr. Hunter** said yes, their standards will still apply. **Ms. Gillespie** referenced the Design Standards that say *“Replacement windows should not have snap-on, flush, or simulated divided muntins. Muntins sandwiched between layers of glass, snap-on muntins, and surface-applied muntins are not appropriate and shall not be approved”*. **Ms. Gillespie** if the muntins are snap-on or between the glass. **Mr. Hunter** said the muntins are between the glass. **Mr. Vernon** asked if the windows that are in the home currently, the original windows to the home. **Mr. Hunter** said yes they were the original windows. **Mr. Vernon** asked to what degree are the windows deteriorated. **Mr. Hunter** said the sashes and the majority of the sills are completely rotted out. **Ms. Gillespie** said she went by the house and did not go in the yard but spoke to the owner, and the windows are in very poor condition. **Ms. Smalls** said this is one of the houses that fall between Church Street and Duke Street. **Mr. Jayroe** said alterations were done on this home in 1960 and this home is within the district, however it would be a contributing resource if the historic district’s period of significance is expanded to include the 1922-1960 period. **Mr. Jayroe** also asked if any of the windows were in usable condition and the right size for the front of the home, and the side windows could be replaced. **Mr. Hunter** said it is a possibility, however he will have to check the measurements, but the windows will not be operable nor have screens, however if the board wants the old windows just for the appearance he would look into that. **Mr. Vernon** asked if the existing windows were glazed. **Mr. Hunter** said they are single paned with glazing. **Mr. Vernon** asked if the old windows were repairable, and if the windows are not replaced would it kill the project for Habitat. **Mr. Hunter** said no the windows are not repairable, and if the windows were not allowed to be replaced it would not let them proceed with that part of the project. **Mr. Jayroe** he had the same concerns that **Mr. Vernon** mentioned, and he asked if what the ARB requires would be outside of what Habitat is allowed to do, when it comes to rebuilding or repairing wood windows. **Mr. Hunter** said he has been involved with restoration of wood windows in other areas and the cost is out of Habitat budget. **Mr. Treavor** said he did not know this home was in the Historic District until he went to pull the permit. **Ms. Smalls** said there is a house on the same street that was approved for vinyl siding, because of the location. **Ms. Smalls** said there are a mixture of houses in this area and several businesses. **Mr. Jayroe** said the house that was allowed to install vinyl siding is in the overlay district and it was discovered later that it should’ve been under the ARB jurisdiction. **Mr. Jayroe** said that he does feel that Habitat for Humanity does good work and hopes that they are able to do repairs to make this home habitable. **Ms. Gillespie** said it would be good if they would consider letting the original

windows be installed on the front and the other windows can be replaced. **Ms. Smalls** said she did not know if it mattered, but the owner said the house was moved to that lot. **Mr. Padgett** said he likes the idea of the original windows staying on the front of the home, however he did not want to discourage Habitat from helping anyone in the district in the future. **Ms. Gillespie** asked Mr. Trevor if he thought it would be a workable suggestion to keep the original windows in the front of the home. **Mr. Hunter** said yes he believes it was 15 windows that needed to be replaced, and to keep the 3 windows on the front original, it would allow 12 replacement windows to be installed. **Mr. Jayroe** asked for information on the door. **Mr. Hunter** said the door will be replaced with a fiberglass, 9 lite with the top having glass with grids, and the jam is vinyl. Mr. Treavor said the door is energy efficient and can be painted, a new storm door will be installed.

Motion: Mr. Padgett made a motion to approve the application citing Design Standards for Residential Properties, Chapter 3; Section 8.0; page 41 (Doors & Entrances) and Chapter 3; Section 17.0; page 68 (Windows & Shutters), with the exception that the original windows are used for the 3 front windows and the other windows be replaced as presented, seconded by Ms. Gillespie; the motion carried 6 to 1 (Mr. Vernon cast the downward vote).

2. **Scott & Rhonda Sawyer are requesting the approval to construct an addition, install operable shutters, windows, doors, enclosing a porch, addition of new porches, and alterations to the roof at 614 Prince St. Tracy Gibson/City Staff** told the board the owners would like to do renovations and a minor addition to the existing home, as well as the existing kitchen house. **Mr. Sebastian Von Marschall/Architect** said the property has 2 structures; the main house will be renovated in the rear, a portion of the porch on the rear is proposed to be enclosed, modifications are being made to some of the windows in the rear wall (not original to the home), operable wood shutters will be installed, and a small bump out will be added on the rear (not visible from the road), this ends the work to be done on the main house. The kitchen house will have a shed roof restored (*old photographs show a shed roof*), it will also be enclosed by adding windows and doors in the openings (*all windows will be true divided light, wooden, and glazed*), the roof will be restored and the chimney shows that the roof line was higher, so the roof will be raised to restore it back to the original profile, finally a shed roof is proposed for the rear of the kitchen house. **Mr. Sawyer/Owner** said when he purchased the home, he did so knowing that Mr. Beau Clowney and his team would perform the restorations, so that it would be kept in character and nothing would be messed up. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if any infill was going to be done between the piers or were they going to stay as is. **Mr. Marschall** said they will remain open but there will be a footer and foundation added for the bump out on the back. **Mr. Vernon** asked if his understanding was correct in that the only thing being added to the main body of the house was the addition of the operable shutters. **Mr. Marschall** said that is correct, however they may come back at a later date with light fixtures. **Mr. Vernon** asked if the handrails on the main structure will remain. **Mr. Marschall** said yes the handrails would remain, as well as the windows on the West side of the house. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if the exterior siding will remain, except where there will be alterations. **Mr. Marschall** said yes,

except for the replacement of rotted materials, which will be replaced with in kind materials. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if the metal roof will be replaced in kind. **Mr. Marschall** said they are proposing a hand crimped standing seam metal roof. **Mr. Vernon** asked about the roof being raised, and asked if it was due to settling of the building. **Mr. Marschall** said they didn't feel like it was settling, because it would be more likely that the chimney would have been lower because of the weight. **Mr. Marschall** said all trim will be replicated. **Mr. Beau Clowney/Architect** said the roof was changed out at some point, and said whatever they do will be in keeping with what was original. **Mr. Clowney** also asked **Mr. Marschall** about a second floor window going out to the porch. **Mr. Marschall** said that was not a part of the main fabric of the house, because it was a part of the enclosed porch.

Motion: Mr. Vernon made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Design Standards for Residential Properties; Chapter 3; Section 8.0; page 41 (Doors & Entrances), Section 17.0; page 68 (Windows & Shutters), Section 14.0; page 57 (Porches, Columns, & Railings), Section 15.0; page 63 (Roofs), and Chapter 5; Section 23.0; page 92 (Additions). Seconded by Mr. Padgett; the motion carried 7 to 0 by a roll call vote.

3. **Mr. & Mrs. Shell are requesting the approval to remove windows, relocation of a door, installation of siding, and replace ceiling covering at 906 Prince Street.** *(Mr. Jayroe said he did work the owners with the purchase of this home)* **Tracy Gibson/City Staff** said the owners would like to remove 2 windows on the side of their home and install siding to enlarge their kitchen, relocate a door and storm door on the rear porch; which will be installed where a window is now in place, siding will be installed where needed, and replace ceiling covering with bead board similar to what is existing on the front porch. **Ms. Shell/Applicant** said the smaller window on the rear right side of the home will be removed and the siding will be installed, if the siding cannot be found a window cover will be installed as shown in exhibit A. All other windows will remain and restored if needed. The door on the rear porch will be removed, replaced with a new door and relocated. The replacement door will be a 2 pane over panel with clear glass (exhibit B). The ramp that is on the side of the porch will remain at this time and they will resubmit for the removal if necessary. **Mr. Vernon** asked about the siding on the home. **Ms. Shell** said the siding on the back of the house is German Siding and the rest of the house has lap siding, the rear siding seems to not be original to the home. **Mr. Jayroe** said in getting the house ready to be listed, the rear exterior wall was exposed and the siding seemed to match the rest of the house. **Ms. Gillespie** said she believed that when this became a commercial property some things were changed to accommodate handicapped issues, and commended the new owners for wanting to put it back to its original state. **Mr. Vernon** asked about the comments about replacement siding being Hardi Plank traditional lap siding and trim. **Ms. Shell** said they have since spoken to the contractor and was told the trim will be an easy match, so they will go back with the wood 5 inch lap siding not Hardi Plank. **Ms. Shell** said they will replace the rear porch ceiling and install bead board to match what's on the front porch. **Mr. Jayroe** said he knows it is not a part of this application, however the ramp on the front, if removed, the previous owners kept the original railings and brackets, so it can be put back in place.

Motion: Mr. Vernon made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with the understanding that the siding replacement in the rear will match the existing, citing Design Standards for Residential Properties, Chapter 2; Section 4.0; page 31 (Siding), Chapter 3; Section 8.0; page 41 (Doors & Entrances), and Chapter 3; Section 17.0; page 68 (Windows & Shutters); seconded by Mr. Padgett; the motion carried 7 to 0 by a roll call vote.

4. **Mr. & Mrs. Chattin** are requesting the approval to replace fascia boards, windows, install operable shutters, and expand the front porch at 316 Queen Street. Tracy Gibson/City Staff said the owners would like to replace rotten fascia boards around the entire home (*the roof will be replaced in-kind; shingle for shingle*), replace windows, install shutters, and extend their front porch 5 ft. and replace the aluminum decorative trim pieces with square posts. **Ms. Chattin/Applicant** said their house is a 1976 brick ranch and they want to make it blend better with the surrounding homes on the street, in doing this the front porch is being expanded for more living space, the roof is in bad shape and will be re-shingled, all the fascia boards are rotted and will have to be replaced, all the windows sills are rotted with the screens missing and also some of the panes. **Mr. Jayroe** asked if the roof would be repaired in kind, it would not need approval, he also asked if the fascia would be in kind. **Ms. Chattin** said the contractor said he has done replacement fascia in wood and vinyl and would do whatever the board approves, however they would like to install vinyl because of the moisture issues in the home. **Mr. Chattin** said if possible they would like to do vinyl/PVC fascia on the sides and the rear and wood on the front. **Mr. Vernon** asked when they say a vinyl fascia does that mean vinyl coated aluminum or PVC. **Mr. Chattin** said it would be a PVC. **Mr. Jayroe** said he knows the board does not do colors, but thought there was something in the guidelines about painting brick. **Ms. Chattin** said they do want to paint the brick a creamy white to coordinate with the dark greys that are going to be on the house and to blend with the neighboring houses, she said she did read in the guidelines that masonry should not be painted if it has never been painted, but in this case they felt like it would make the house look more historical than the 1976 brick. (*The Board agreed that they were some houses in the district that the brick had been painted without the board's review, Mr. Padgett said he thought the guidelines on painted brick was for the Core Commercial District*). **Mr. Chattin** asked how the board felt about the fascia being wood all around or could they use the PVC on the sides and the rear. **Mr. Vernon** said because this house was built in 1976, and would not contribute even if the dates of significance was extended, it gives the owners a bit of leeway in what's allowed in repairs, with that said they could use PVC, Hardi trim, or the new board trim. **Mr. Jayroe** said Mr. Vernon said something that he did not consider, but because of the time period of this house, for a lack of a better term, would it be considered a new/newer construction. **Mr. Vernon** said he is thinking that as well. **Ms. Gillespie** said she was surprised by the date of the home also, but that the board needed to keep in mind the materials that were available at the time the house was built and should take that into consideration as to what is appropriate for this project. **Mr. Jayroe** said this house was built since the ARB Board was in existence, he suspects the materials were approved by the board at that time, he also said in looking at the renderings and drawings of the porch it seems to be an appropriate bump out and this type of porch is seen

all around Georgetown, he referenced a house on Cannon and Front Street. **Ms. Gillespie** said she did some research on the windows and this house comes under modern houses with the ranches or minimal traditional styles; the proposed windows are often found in older historic homes. **Ms. Gillespie** said typically the windows would be 2 over 2 with horizontal lines or 6 over 6; to have 2 over 1 or 3 over 1 are usually for older style homes, she also said the windows should be true divided. **Ms. Chattin** said the hope is to try and get away from the 1976 Ranch style home, because it does not give a historical look, she said she understands that the city is trying to keep the original look of the homes, however the other houses on the street have an historical look and they just want to blend in with them. She said if they are going to stay with the 1976 Ranch look, then the porch that they are proposing would not work, nor the change of the roof color. The desire is to make the house look like a historical home. **Ms. Gillespie** said there are other Ranch style homes in the district and they work well in the neighborhoods, and perhaps the Ranch style should be honored instead of blending in and being perceived as something that it is not. **Mr. Vernon** said he had no issues with the owners trying to modify their home, and if they choose to modify the windows he would not be opposed to that. **Mr. Jayroe** said the windows that are currently on the home are 8 over 8 that give a cottage look, and said the board did approve 2 over 1 windows for a home within the block. **Mr. Jayroe** said he understands what **Ms. Gillespie** is saying, however the owners are trying to keep the rhythm of the neighborhood. **Ms. Chattin** said they would like to change the picture window in the front of the home to 3 operable windows of the same size. **Ms. Gillespie** said she had no problem with changing the front window to 3 windows of the same size, however she feels the top of the windows need to be balanced with the bottom, referencing pages 11 and 12 of the packet, with the 2 over 2 windows. **Ms. Chattin** said they could do the 2 over 2 windows. **Mr. Vernon** asked the size of the post on the proposed front porch. **Mr. Chattin** said it would be a 6 x 6 wrapped, so they would be 8 inch posts. **Mr. Vernon** said 8 inches would be fine, the drawing just made them appear larger. **Ms. Chattin** said because this was their first experience with the ARB Board, she has not spoken to the contractor about the porch, but once she tells him what she wants then she can inform the board. **Mr. Vernon** said the handrails on the porch are not labeled on the drawings, and appear to be metal. **Ms. Chattin** said the handrails will be constructed of wood. **Mr. Chattin** said the piers would be constructed of brick, the decking would be of wood or trek. **Ms. Chattin** asked if the board wanted them to bring the porch back at a later date, with plans. **Mr. Vernon** asked what the time frame was for the construction, and asked if they wanted to begin in the next couple of weeks. **Ms. Chattin** said they would like to start as soon as they get the approvals, they would like to do the roof and the fascia first, however without the approval of the porch they can't do the roof because it would change the entire profile of the roof line if the porch is added. **Mr. Jayroe** said the porch floor could be of alternative materials since it is not readily seen, per the guidelines. **Mr. Padgett** said he did not have a problem with manmade materials being used on this home. **Ms. McManus** asked if the board would consider voting on the porch since it is a part of the application. **Mr. Jayroe** agreed, because it was listed on the application, however he said he knows the board likes to see the details on the railings and other items. **Ms. Chattin** asked if the board wanted to make the approval contingent on her getting the detailed plans from the contractor and forward them to the board. **Mr.**

Chattin asked if the board preferred the balusters to be wood or metal. **Mr. Jayroe** said he thought the owners wanted wood, which is fine. **Mr. & Mrs. Chattin** said they would prefer wood balusters, wood handrails, wood columns, brick/concrete steps, and brick footings/piers. **Mr. Padgett** asked if they would underpin between the piers. **Ms. Chattin** said she was not sure, but then said square lattice would be installed between the piers. **Ms. Chattin** said the shutters will be operable, louvered shutters on all windows except the front windows. **Ms. Gillespie** asked what shutters would be put on the front windows. **Ms. Chattin** said there would not be shutters on the front windows. **Ms. Gillespie** said storm windows could be added for protection. **Ms. Smalls** asked about the window on the left side of the porch. **Ms. Chattin** said all windows will have shutters, except the 3 windows of the same size on the front of the house and a very small window on the rear.

Motion: Mr. Padgett made a motion to approve the application as submitted, , citing Design Standards for Residential Properties; Chapter 3; Section 17.0; page 68 (Windows & Shutters) noting that the windows will be 2 over 2, the shutters will be operable and louvered; and Section 14.0; page 57 (Porches, Columns, & Railings) noting columns and handrails will be wood, the decking will be trek, the fascia will be neither wood or PVC, and the underpinning of the porch extension will be squared lattice. (There was not a second on this motion and it failed)

Ms. Small asked for clarity of the window material. **Mr. & Mrs. Chattin** said it has been hard for them finding wooden windows so it would be PVC, with a wood grain look and the muntins on the outside. **Ms. Smalls** said she felt like there were a lot of things still up in the air, even though a motion had been made. **Mr. Padgett** said there was no second on the motion so it could be withdrawn. **Ms. Gillespie** said there had been a lot of things that had been changed and agreed upon, however there are a lot of grey areas and said it is not easy doing the applications over the phone and not be able to see everything, she asked if the applicants would agree to resubmit and come back next month with clarifications in writing and present it a second time. **Mr. Vernon** said he agreed with that, because at this time it seemed too opened ended and undefined. **Ms. Abate** said she too would like to see everything in writing. **Mr. Chattin** asked if it would be possible just to focus on the approval of the windows only and everything else could be resubmitted next month, he asked if the 2 over 2 PVC window be acceptable. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if they would be true divided. **Mr. Padgett** said hurricane windows are not true divided. **Mr. Chattin** said the grids would be on the exterior but not the interior, and said the current windows are horrible. **Mr. Chattin** asked if they could replace the side and rear and hold off on the front. **Ms. Gillespie** said the appropriate windows would be single pane, true divided, wood windows; even though the home is not contributing it may become contributing someday, so think it is important for the owners to stay true to the time that it was built as well as to the materials. **Mr. Chattin** said all the distributors they spoke to told them about the hurricane windows and the DP-50 rated windows. **Ms. Gillespie** said it is her understanding that the historic district does not have a restriction on the ratings of windows, it is the owner's choice, and the ARB is interested in what is appropriate to the building. **Ms. Chattin** said she was unaware of that, because the contractors were telling her something different, unless they were misinformed

also. **Mr. Chattin** asked what kind of window they will need to get for approval. **Mr. Jayroe** suggested getting wood windows in the same size and design of the windows in the house. **Ms. Chattin** said no, that would be too expensive, approximately \$1,000 per window. **Ms. Gillespie** said she didn't believe that was true, and suggested they look at the Marvin series windows, or other manufactures. **Mr. Chattin** asked what happened to the flexibility given due to the fact that the house was built in 1976 and could be viewed as a new/newer construction. **Kevin Jayroe** said the guidelines does state that windows of alterative material may be considered (referencing Chapter 3; Section 17.3). **Mr. Chattin** asked Ms. Gillespie if the issue was the windows being true divided. **Ms. Gillespie** said yes. **Mr. Chattin** said he did not think he could find a vinyl true divided window. **Ms. Gillespie** said she wasn't sure, but believed they could find a vinyl true divided window. **Mr. Chattin** said they would do some research, and would try to contact the home owner suggested by Mr. Jayroe, on the corner of Duke and Queen Street, he asked for the board's approval for 2 over 2 true divided windows and if they can't find them they would present something else when they come back next month. **Ms. Gillespie** said the board has approved several true divided windows, some being wood, and some being vinyl clad. **Mr. Chattin** asked if they would need to include gutters on their application for approval. **Mr. Jayroe** said gutters would have to be add to the application, because there are different styles. *(After much discussion it was agreed that if the owners could find the 2 over 2 true divided, insulated glass windows it would be acceptable).* **Ms. Abate** had concerns about allowing the windows to be installed and having the owners change their minds after the other approvals are given. **Mr. Jayroe** said he felt the windows may define the project, and there are other windows on this street with the same style windows.

Motion: **Ms. Gillespie** made a motion to approve the application for the windows, that they will be 2 over 2, true divided, insulated glass; there will be a triple window on the front right hand side, the other windows will be single, the material of the windows is the discretion of the home owner, and all other items on the application will come back next month on a new application, citing Design Standards for Residential Properties, Chapter 3; Section 17.0; page 68 (Windows & Shutters), seconded by **Ms. Abate**; the motion carried 6 to 0 by a roll vote *(Mr. Vernon had left the meeting).* *The Board amended the original vote to allow the windows to be 2 over 2, simulated divided vinyl windows; there will be a triple window on the front right hand side*

5. **Mr. Greg Plummer** is requesting the approval to replace windows at 317 King St. **Tracy Gibson/City Staff** said the owners would like to replace windows in their home. **Mr. Harold Long/Representative** said there are 6 over 6 wooden windows that are not insulated are currently in the home. The windows are only 12 years old, (not the original windows) and are totally rotted, the owner would like to install vinyl windows with no grids. **Mr. Jayroe** said the home is not contributing to the district, but would be if the period was expanded. **Mr. Long** asked what the board thought about vinyl windows in this home. **Mr. Jayroe** said in the cottage houses the style of windows really dictate the house, and the 6 over 6 windows are the appropriate style. **Mr. Long** asked if there was any way they could do the 6 over 6 insulated glass windows with the grids in the glass. **Ms. Gillespie** said true divided

insulated glass windows would be acceptable for this home, she also said she visited the home and the windows are in poor condition, and the owner certainly needs to make a change, however said maybe the board would be opened to other styles of windows, but some grids would be better than no grids. **Mr. Padgett** suggested 6 over 1 windows. **Mr. Long** said the owner might be opened to that suggestion. **Mr. Jayroe** said he feels a 6 over 1 window would be an appropriate look for the house. **Ms. McManus** said she also agree with the 6 over 1 windows. **Mr. Long** asked if the window has to be 6 over 1 divided glass or could it be a solid glass with the grids inside. **Mr. Padgett** said the window should be true divided and insulated. **Ms. McManus** said it should be true divided meaning the mullions are not in the glass. **Ms. Gillespie** said true divided means the pieces of glass are separate from each other. **Mr. Jayroe** said with the house being a Colonial Revival the 6 over 1 windows are appropriate. **Mr. Long** asked if they could do the 6 over 1 one the front of the home and do 1 over 1 on the sides and the rear. **Ms. Gillespie** said she saw a house in Willowbank (outside the district) that was of the similar style home and it has 1 over 1 windows and it looks nice and that maybe something that could be considered. **Mr. Jayroe** said he did not have a problem with the changing of the windows, because some homes have changed styles over the lifespan of the home. The Board agreed that the 6 over 1 true divided, insulated windows for the front of the home and 1 over 1 for the rest of the windows.

Motion: **Mr. Padgett** made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Design Standards for Residential Properties, Chapter 3; Section 17.0; page 68 (Windows & Shutters), with the stipulation that the front windows will be 6 over 1, true divided, insulated windows, the side and rear will be 1 over 1 insulated windows, and all material is to the owner's discretion (per Chapter 3; Section 17.6), seconded by Ms. Gillespie; the motion carried 6 to 0 by a roll call vote (*Mr. Vernon left the meeting*).

VI. Board Discussion:

- **Ms. Smalls** asked that an announcement be made to let everyone on the tele-conference know that their phones should be muted when they are not talking.
- **Mr. Jayroe** asked that all Board Members visit all the sites that are on the agenda.

VII. Adjournment: With there being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Submitted By,

*Debra Grant
Board Secretary*